

On the two-dimensional Fermion Determinant at Finite Temperature

C.D. Fosco^{a*}, R.E. Gamboa Saraví^{b*} and F.A. Schaposnik^{b†}

^a*Centro Atómico Bariloche, 8400 Bariloche, Argentina*

^b*Departamento de Física, Universidad Nacional de La Plata
C.C. 67, 1900 La Plata, Argentina*

February 1, 2008

Abstract

We evaluate the fermionic determinant for massless QED_2 at finite temperature, in the imaginary time formalism. By using a decoupling transformation of the fermionic fields, we show that the determinant factorizes into the usual, temperature independent expression, times an extra factor which depends on the temperature and on the constant component of the gauge field.

*CONICET, Argentina

†Investigador CICBA

Recent results on the finite temperature effective action for fermions in a gauge field background A_μ in $0 + 1$ [1]-[3], $2 + 1$ [4]-[12], $1 + 1$ [13] and $d + 1$ [14] dimensions have revealed new and interesting features, showing in particular that $S_{eff}[A_\mu]$ can be a non-extensive quantity depending on A_μ in a non-polynomial way.

In the present note we reconsider the $1 + 1$ case, that is, we analyse the effective action for the massless Schwinger Model at finite temperature, following a covariant approach based in the introduction of a heat-bath velocity u_μ [15]. In fact, the fermion determinant for two dimensional massless fermions in a gauge field background has been computed using different techniques both for topologically trivial and non trivial backgrounds (where zero modes have to be carefully handled) [16]-[22]. Here, we want to clarify, in connection with the results of [13], the way in which the heat bath velocity can be connected with non-trivial boundary conditions leading to a result which is related to that obtained in [21] in the analysis of the fermion determinant considering zero modes in the various topological sectors. As we shall see, taking into account the heat-bath velocity is tantamount to considering a constant gauge field background (or, equivalently, twisted boundary conditions for the fermions and no constant background). We will find that there is a contribution to the fermion determinant which depends on u_μ , this showing that in general the Schwinger Model effective action is not a trivial extension of the zero temperature one.

We shall begin by dealing with $\mathcal{Z}[A]$, the two dimensional fermionic determinant in the presence of an Abelian $U(1)$ gauge field in the imaginary time formalism

$$\mathcal{Z}[A] = \det[i\cancel{\partial} + ie \cancel{A}] = \int \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} \mathcal{D}\psi \exp \left[-S_F(\bar{\psi}, \psi; A) \right] \quad (1)$$

where the action functional S_F is given by

$$S_F[\bar{\psi}, \psi; A] = \int_0^\beta d\tau \int dx \bar{\psi}(\tau, x) [\cancel{\partial} + ie \cancel{A}(\tau, x)] \psi(\tau, x) \quad (2)$$

where τ denotes the imaginary time, x the (sole) space coordinate, and $\beta = \frac{1}{T}$. Spacetime is Euclidean, and the fields obey the standard boundary conditions at $T > 0$

$$A_\mu(\beta, x) = A_\mu(0, x) \quad \forall x \quad \mu = 1, 2,$$

$$\psi(\beta, x) = -\psi(0, x) \ , \ \bar{\psi}(\beta, x) = -\bar{\psi}(0, x) \ \forall x \ . \quad (3)$$

It is a well established result [16]-[22] that at finite temperature this fermionic determinant is formally identical to the zero temperature one, but only if the (often non sufficiently emphasized) assumption is made that the external gauge field is topologically trivial in the sense that its holonomy around the periodic time coordinate is trivial. We shall show that relaxing this assumption leads to a more general answer. Moreover, it should of course lead to the usual result when the same kind of configuration is considered.

We shall decompose the external gauge field A_μ as follows

$$A_\mu = \frac{1}{e}(\partial_\mu \varphi + i\epsilon_{\mu\nu}\partial_\nu \sigma) \ . \quad (4)$$

It follows from eq.(4) that the scalar fields φ and σ satisfy the equations

$$\partial^2 \varphi = e \partial \cdot A \quad \partial^2 \sigma = ie \epsilon_{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu A_\nu \ . \quad (5)$$

It must be noted that equations (5) only determine the fields φ and σ up to a solution of Laplace equation. Namely,

$$\begin{aligned} \varphi(\tau, x) &= \varphi^{(0)}(\tau, x) + \tilde{\varphi}(\tau, x) \\ \sigma(\tau, x) &= \sigma^{(0)}(\tau, x) + \tilde{\sigma}(\tau, x) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

with

$$\partial^2 \varphi^{(0)}(\tau, x) = 0 \ , \ \partial^2 \sigma^{(0)}(\tau, x) = 0 \quad (7)$$

and $\tilde{\varphi}$, $\tilde{\sigma}$ particular solutions of (5).

The new, non trivial, part of A_μ , playing a central role in our calculation, may be thought of as coming from $\varphi^{(0)}$ and $\sigma^{(0)}$: indeed, at $T = 0$ there is no reason to include non-trivial solutions of the Laplace equations, since the spacetime manifold is trivial, and a regular solution is necessarily a constant (giving no contribution to A). Of course, Poincaré invariance also forbids the imposition of any non trivial boundary condition at infinity. On the other hand, at finite temperature the topology of spacetime is the one of a cylinder, and moreover there is no Poincaré invariance. The partition function of a system, in the canonical ensemble say, is defined in terms of the Hamiltonian, a non-covariant object. Moreover, the definition of this ensemble implicitly assumes the existence of a preferential reference frame, the one where the

thermal bath is at rest with respect to the system. When there is relative motion between the system and the bath, we should expect the results to depend not only on the energy, but also on the other available integrals of motion of the system: for example its momentum [23], which is simply related to the velocity ¹.

This implies that we may now write the general solutions to (7) using a constant vector, the velocity u_μ with respect to the bath. It is not hard to realize that the most general solution (compatible with the periodicity of A in the time direction) is a linear function of the coordinates. The only available vector coefficient to build up a scalar is something proportional to u_μ :

$$\varphi^{(0)} = a u_\mu x_\mu, \quad \sigma^{(0)} = b u_\mu x_\mu \quad (8)$$

where a and b are constants. The relation between the coefficients a and b and A_μ is determined by the equations

$$A_\mu^{(0)} = \frac{1}{e}(a u_\mu + i b \epsilon_{\mu\nu} u_\nu) \quad \mu = 0, 1, \quad (9)$$

where $A_\mu^{(0)}$ denotes the zero momentum (i.e., constant) component of the gauge field.

With this remark in mind, we see the gauge field A appearing in the fermionic determinant is of the form

$$A_\mu = A_\mu^{(0)} + \tilde{A}_\mu \quad (10)$$

where

$$\tilde{A}_\mu = \frac{1}{e}(\partial_\mu \tilde{\varphi} + i \epsilon_{\mu\nu} \partial_\nu \tilde{\sigma}). \quad (11)$$

Of course, $\tilde{A}$ has no zero momentum component, and in consequence the scalar fields $\tilde{\varphi}$ and $\tilde{\sigma}$ are strictly periodic in the time coordinate τ . It should be noted that the "new" part of the gauge field we are including in this study is, in Fourier space, proportional to a delta function of Euclidean momentum. This suggests a connection with the perturbative study by Das et al in real time, where the extra piece found in the effective action has support for $k^2 = 0$. This support, when mapped to Euclidean spacetime, becomes $k_\mu = 0$.

¹As the total fermionic charge is conserved, one may also introduce the total current.

The $\tilde{A}$ part of the gauge field may be entirely decoupled by the anomalous Jacobian method, just by noting that

$$S_F(\bar{\psi}, \psi; A) = \int_0^\beta d\tau \int dx \bar{\psi}(\tau, x) e^{-ie(\tilde{\varphi} - \gamma_5 \tilde{\sigma})} (\not{\partial} + ie A^{(0)}) e^{ie(\tilde{\varphi} + \gamma_5 \tilde{\sigma})} \psi(\tau, x) \quad (12)$$

and defining the new fermionic fields

$$\begin{aligned} \chi &= \exp(ie(\tilde{\varphi} + \gamma_5 \tilde{\sigma})) \psi \\ \bar{\chi} &= \bar{\psi} \exp(-ie(\tilde{\varphi} - \gamma_5 \tilde{\sigma})) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Then, one can write

$$\mathcal{Z}(A) = J(A^{(0)}, \tilde{A}) \times \mathcal{Z}(A^{(0)}) \quad (14)$$

where $J(A^{(0)}, \tilde{A})$ denotes the anomalous Jacobian for the transformation (13).

Eq.(14) represents one of the main steps in our calculation: we have managed to factorize the fermion determinant into one factor which corresponds to the usual Jacobian leading, as we shall see, to the usual Schwinger determinant but in a domain $(0, L) \times (0, \beta)$, times a determinant in a constant background which is in fact related to the velocity u_μ with respect to the bath. (For the sake of generality we also assume that the space like coordinate is finite, with length L , and the fermions are periodic in this direction. This shall also be important when considering the thermodynamic limit).

Now we shall show that J is actually *independent of* $A^{(0)}$, what makes it identical to the standard, zero temperature like result (with the imaginary time integral in the domain $(0, \beta)$). To show this property we only have to realize that the Jacobian for an infinitesimal axial transformation is independent of $A^{(0)}$, since the finite transformation is built as an iteration of infinitesimal ones. The infinitesimal axial transformation

$$\psi \rightarrow \psi + i\alpha\gamma_5\psi, \quad \bar{\psi} \rightarrow \bar{\psi} + i\alpha\bar{\psi}\gamma_5, \quad (15)$$

induces a Jacobian

$$J = \exp[i\mathcal{A}] \quad (16)$$

with

$$\mathcal{A} = \text{Tr}[\alpha\gamma_5] \quad (17)$$

where the trace is meant to be on Dirac indices, as well as on functional space. As usual, to make sense of $\mathcal{A}$, we define it as the limit of a regularized

expression:

$$\mathcal{A} = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr}[\alpha \gamma_5 f(\frac{\not{D}^2}{M^2})] \quad (18)$$

where f is a function that verifies

$$f(0) = 1 \ , \ f(\infty) = f'(\infty) = \dots = 0 \ . \quad (19)$$

Now we write the trace in terms of eigenstates of the free Dirac operator, which are free spinors, with a discrete time component for the momentum

$$\mathcal{A} = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \text{tr} \left\{ \frac{1}{\beta} \sum_n \int \frac{dk}{2\pi} \langle n, k | [\alpha \gamma_5 f(\frac{\not{D}^2}{M^2})] | n, k \rangle \right\} \ . \quad (20)$$

The sum over n can be put as an integral over a continuum momentum, plus a temperature dependent term which picks up contributions from the single poles of f . We shall assume that f is a meromorphic function with no singularities on the real axis. The temperature dependent term obviously vanishes in the limit $M \rightarrow \infty$, since there is one integration over momentum less than required to give a non-zero contribution. Indeed, this is what happens in the usual proof of the temperature independence of the anomaly. Thus we are lead to an expression like (20) but with a double integral rather than a sum and an integral. Yet it is not identical to the zero temperature Jacobian, since $\not{D}^2$ depends on the constant component of A ,

$$\not{D}^2 = D^2(A) + \frac{ie}{4} [\gamma_\mu, \gamma_\nu] F_{\mu\nu}(\tilde{A}) \quad (21)$$

where the only dependence on $A^{(0)}$ comes from $D^2(A)$. But this dependence is erased by a simple shift of the (now continuous) timelike momentum, thus the Jacobian is independent of $A^{(0)}$.

After some standard calculation, we then have from eqs.(16)-(21)

$$J[A^{(0)}, \tilde{A}] = \exp \left(-\frac{e^2}{2\pi} \int_0^\beta d\tau \int_0^L dx \tilde{A}_\mu \Delta^{\mu\nu} \tilde{A}_\nu \right) \quad (22)$$

with $\Delta_{\mu\nu}$ given by

$$\Delta_{\mu\nu} = \delta_{\mu\nu} - \partial_\mu \partial^{-2} \delta_\nu \quad (23)$$

There only remains to evaluate the constant field determinant

$$\mathcal{Z}(A^{(0)}) = \det[\not{\partial} + ie A^{(0)}] \ . \quad (24)$$

It is immediate to realize that, as the fermions are massless, the determinant can be factorized into two constant field determinants, one for each chirality

$$\mathcal{Z}(A^{(0)}) = \det(D_0 + iD_1) \det(D_0 - iD_1) \exp(-q) , \quad (25)$$

where q is a counterterm which can be identified with the non holomorphic residue [24]. Each one of the chiral determinants can be exactly calculated following for example the technique described in this last reference so that one arrives to the result

$$\mathcal{Z}(A^{(0)}) = \exp[-\Gamma(A^{(0)})] , \quad (26)$$

with

$$\Gamma(A^{(0)}) = -\log \left| \frac{\vartheta(\alpha, \tau)}{\vartheta(0, \tau)} \right|^2 + \frac{e^2}{2\pi} \beta L A_\mu^{(0)} A^{(0)\mu} \quad (27)$$

where the Jacobi Theta function ϑ may be defined by a single series representation

$$\vartheta(\alpha, \tau) = \sum_n e^{i\pi\tau n^2 + 2\pi i n \alpha} , \quad (28)$$

and

$$\tau = i\frac{L}{\beta} , \quad \alpha = -\frac{L}{2\pi} (A_1^{(0)} - iA_0^{(0)}) . \quad (29)$$

The first term in the r.h.s. of eq.(27) corresponds to the product of holomorphic and antiholomorphic factors arising in the computation of chiral determinants in a constant background. The second term is just q and represents the obstruction to holomorphic factorization. It can be computed just by demanding the complete determinant to be gauge-invariant.

We then have, putting together (22) and (27) that $\mathcal{Z}(A)$ as given by (14) can be written in the form

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}(A) = & \exp \left(-\frac{e^2}{2\pi} \int_0^\beta d\tau \int_0^L dx \tilde{A}_\mu \Delta^{\mu\nu} \tilde{A}_\nu \right) \exp \left(-\frac{e^2}{2\pi} \beta L A_\mu^{(0)} A^{(0)\mu} \right) \times \\ & \left| \frac{\vartheta(\alpha, \tau)}{\vartheta(0, \tau)} \right|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

or, in view of the boundary conditions, more compactly as

$$\mathcal{Z}(A) = \exp \left(-\frac{e^2}{2\pi} \int_0^\beta d\tau \int_0^L dx A_\mu \Delta^{\mu\nu} A_\nu \right) \left| \frac{\vartheta(\alpha, \tau)}{\vartheta(0, \tau)} \right|^2 \quad (31)$$

which is our main result. It is worth emphasizing a nontrivial property satisfied by this expression, namely, that the contributions coming from topological (non-zero constant field component) and non-topological gauge field configurations are neatly decoupled. This is in fact a consequence of the independence of the chiral anomaly on the long distance properties of the system. This decoupling is in fact also observed in the real time formulation calculation presented in ([13]), where one sees that the difference between the result presented therein and the usual is non-vanishing only for gauge fields having support on the light cone.

We note that to find the *explicit* form of relation (9) would require the calculation, for example, of the expectation value of the total momentum as a function of A .

Acknowledgments: F.A.S. thanks the Laboratoire de Physique Théorique et Hautes Energies de l'Université de Paris VII for kind hospitality during part of this work. C.D.F. thanks the members of the Department of Physics of the University of Oxford where part of his work on this subject was done. We acknowledge A.J. da Silva for some useful comments. This work is partially supported by CICBA, CONICET (PIP 4330/96), ANPCyT grants (PICT 97-2285) and 03-00000-02249, and Fundación Antorchas, Argentina.

References

- [1] G. Dunne, K. Lee and Ch. Lu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78** (1997) 3434.
- [2] A. Das and G. Dunne, Phys. Rev. **D57** (1998) 5023.
- [3] J. Barcelos-Neto and A. Das, Phys. Rev. **D58** (1998) 085022.
- [4] S. Deser, L. Griguolo and D. Seminara, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79** (1997) 1976;
Phys. Rev. **D57** (1998) 7444.
- [5] C.D.Fosco, G.L.Rossini and F.A.Schaposnik, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79** (1997)
1980 and *errata ibid* **79** (1997) 4296; Phys. Rev. **D56** (1997) 6547.
- [6] I.J.R.Aitchinson and C.D.Fosco, Phys. Rev. **D57** (1998) 1171.
- [7] R. Jackiw and S.Y. Pi, Phys. Lett. **B423** (998) 364.
- [8] R. Jackiw and S.Y. Pi, hep-th/9808036.
- [9] C. Fosco, Phys. Rev. **D57** (1998) 6554.
- [10] L. Salcedo, hep-th/9802071.
- [11] A.N. Sisakian, O.Yu. Shevchenko and S.B. Solganik, hep-th/9806047.
- [12] E.M. Prodanov and S. Sen, hep-th/9810044.
- [13] A. Das and A.J. da Silva, hep-th/9808027.
- [14] C.D.Fosco, G.L.Rossini and F.A.Schaposnik, hep-th/9810194, to be
published in Phys. Rev. **D**.
- [15] H.A. Weldon, Phys. Rev. **D26** (1982) 1394.
- [16] S. Love, Phys. Rev. **D23** (1981) 420.
- [17] K. Starn and J. Visser, J.Phys **G11** (1985) L143.
- [18] F. Ruiz Ruiz and R.F. Alvarez Estrada, Phys. Lett **B180** (1986) 153;
Phys. Lett **B182** (1986) 354; Phys. Rev. **D35** (1987) 3161.
- [19] A. Das and A. Karev, Phys. Rev. **D26** (1987) 623.

- [20] H. Joos, Nucl. Phys. **B17** (1990) 704; Helv. Phys. Acta. **63** (1990) 670.
- [21] I. Sachs and A. Wipf, Helv. Phys. Acta **65** (1992) 652.
- [22] S. Dürr and A. Wipf, Ann. Phys. (NY) 255 (1997) 333.
- [23] L.D. Landau and I.M. Lifshitz, Statistical Physics, Pergamon Press, London, 1975.
- [24] L. Alvarez Gaumé, G. Moore and C. Vafa, Comm. Math. Phys. **106** (1986) 1.